REMARKS

In response to the non-final Official Action of July 21, 2010, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims for the reasons presented below.

To illustrate the nature of the present invention as claimed, an example of the methodology will be presented. For example, say a user of a device has previously been browsing the internet and then, at some later time, wishes to compose and send an MMS message based on an image the user recalls seeing earlier (see paragraph 20 of the present specification). With prior art copy-pasting techniques, the user would have to have already selected that image for copying at the time of viewing and manually save that image to be able to paste it later.

However, in the present invention, as set forth in claim 1, the user can easily transfer the latest image downloaded from the internet into the message _without_ manual saving of the item. This is achieved via a tracing application on the device:

- "_automatic tracing of a latest operation_", e.g. tracing the internet browsing;
- "_extracting at least one item from the traced operation_", e.g. extracting the viewed image without manual copying or saving being needed;
- "_automatically recording the at least one extracted item into a list of recorded items in a file..._", e.g. recording that image in a centralized location along with items of different media types;
- "_presenting, upon the tracing application being called by at least one target application located on said device, the recorded item list of the tracing application to the at least one target application to allow for user-selection of one or more recorded items from the list_" – This allows a user to call the tracing application to thereby cause a list of extracted items to be presented, including the desired image that was automatically recorded without user specific instruction. The user is then able to select the desired image that was viewed previously; and
- "_providing the one or more user-selected items to the at least one target application_" – this causes the selected image to be provided into the MMS message.

In summary, the recorded items are extracted from various operations automatically by using the tracing application so that the recorded items can be

conveniently and easily called by a user, upon calling the tracing application, for pasting/providing the item into a target application. No specific manual recording actions need to be taken by the user – the automatic tracing and recording takes care of this for the user. This is in stark contrast to the technical objectives of both Bennett and Bates, as discussed below.

Bennett

Bennett discusses systems and methods for identifying and extracting data from unstructured text to produce a structured set of templates with the extracted data. This is then used, for example, to categorize or assign relevance to the source documents, or to automatically integrate that data into applications across the device (see, for example, Bennett, paragraph [0026]). The newly structured data can also be automatically delivered and integrated with different types of user devices in accordance with stored criteria associated with each device (see Bennett, Abstract). Paragraphs [0055] and [0056] of Bennett explain that unstructured data that is extracted (e.g. from incoming messages – see paragraph [0054]) can be reformatted into different kinds of output such as audio, video, graphic, etc.

Based on this teaching, it is respectfully submitted that the technical objective of Bennett is to take information received or entered on a given device (as part of a network), *reformat* that information into a different output (e.g. unstructured to structured, or different format), and *automatically share and integrate* the extracted information in the different format with applications across that device and/or other devices of a network (see Bennett, paragraphs [0055] and [0056]).

With reference to the MMS example discussed above, Bennett does not appear to discuss that a user can "call" a tracing application (or equivalent) in order to allow provision of one or more items upon user instruction. The provision of extracted items appears to be predetermined and fully automatic. As a result, it does not appear that there is any way that a user can choose to call any extracted "templates" for provision into a target application – all such provision is automatic and "behind-the-scenes" in Bennett. This is in contrast to the present invention as set forth in claim 1 which allows users to call the tracing application that has already traced, extracted and recorded

items for possible use automatically, and then select a desired item/items for provision into a target application using the tracing application.

Without such a callable tracing application, it is respectfully submitted that a user of a device in accordance with the teaching of Bennett could _not_ create an MMS message based on a previously viewed image, for example, as it would not be possible for the user to select and provide the desired image using a called tracing application in the manner described above.

Bates

Bates discusses _manually_ operated copying and pasting actions for different types of content (e.g. text, images, text extracted from images as identified by the Office). These selecting/copying/pasting actions are totally manual – the content to be copied must be selected manually, the instruction to copy must come from the user, and the instruction to paste must come manually from the user – selection for copying and pasting is totally _manual_ in this document.

This "manual copy-pasting" has been discussed at length in applicants' amendment of May 17, 2010 and the difficulties associated with prior art copy-pasting methods are discussed in detail in paragraphs 2 to 10 of the present specification. With reference to the MMS example discussed above, if a user using a device in accordance with Bates desired to compose an MMS message based on a previously viewed image, then the user would need to have _manually_ saved that image at the time of viewing (see paragraph 20 of the present specification). This is in stark contrast with the present invention as set forth in claim 1 which uses a tracing application to automatically extract and record such items for possible future calling and use. Therefore, without such automatic tracing, extraction and recordal, it is respectfully submitted that a user of such a device could _not_ create an MMS message based on a previously viewed image, for example, as it would not be possible for the user to call an image that had not already been manually saved.

In summary, Bennett relates to fully automatic extraction and provision of reformatted text data to promote sharing and structuring of data across devices while Bates relates to fully manual copying and pasting actions to allow for user controllable copying and pasting. It is therefore not seen how these two documents could be

4

combined to arrive at the features of the present invention as set forth in claim 1. For example, if starting from either document, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have to abandon the manual saving or automatic share/integration aspects of Bates or Bennett respectively, which would negate the benefits associated with each of these documents.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not ignore these aspects of Bates or Bennett as they are central to the teachings of these documents respectively. It is therefore further respectfully submitted that ignoring such central teachings of the cited references would amount to using an un-allowable hindsight approach to arrive at just particular features of the respective documents to argue the presence of features corresponding to those set forth in claim 1. The provision of a tracing application to allow for automatic extracting/recording and subsequent use of an item, using the call tracing application, is not provided or suggested in these references.

Furthermore, in view of the distinct advantages provided by the present invention as set forth in claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 demonstrates its distinction over the cited art as argued by the Office.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 1 is distinguished over Bennett in view of Bates.

Independent claims 15 and 30 recite features corresponding to those of independent method claim 1 and, for similar reasons, are also believed to be distinguished over the cited art.

Dependent claims 2, 3, 5-14, 16, 18-29, 33, 34, and 38 are also believed to be distinguished over Bennett in view of Bates at least in view of their ultimate dependency from an independent claim which is believed to be allowable.

Furthermore, dependent claims 35 and 36 are each rejected under 35 USC §103(a) in view of Bennett further in view of Bates, as well as an additional reference as set forth at pages 11-12 of the Office Action. These claims are also believed to be allowable at least in view of their ultimate dependency from claim 1.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is therefore respectfully submitted that the claims of the present application are distinguished over the cited references and

reconsideration of the rejection of the claims based on these references is earnestly solicited.

The undersigned respectfully submits that no fee is due for filing this Response. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to deposit account 23-0442 any fee deficiency required to submit this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: <u>October 21, 2010</u>   <u>   /Alfred A. Fressola/   </u>

Alfred A. Fressola
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27,550

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
     & ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955